

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

A telephone interview was held between Examiner David Lewis and Michael Ferrazano representing the Applicant on May 26, 2009. The prior art was discussed in relation to the Advisory Action mailed on 4/30/09. No agreement was reached.

REMARKS

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner has rejected a number of claims under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 7,289,824 issued to Jerbi et al. (which has been discussed at length in previous responses). In particular, at page 3 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner notes, “art anticipates shape given finger differentiation feature”. During the interview, the Applicant pointed to the section (column 3 starting at line 22) of Jerbi believed to be used by the Examiner in the rejection. In particular, starting a line 22, “the *registered fingerprints and/or their orientation*, in particular of several fingers, may be used for inputting characters....Thus, for example, the fingers from the thumb to the little finger, and/or their imprint in a vertical orientation as shown in Fig. 2, represent the digits “1”, “2”, “3”,”. (emphasis added) Accordingly, the Applicants believe that Jerbi is referring to the registered fingerprints (and their orientations) on the fingers, not the shape of the fingers themselves to be able to distinguish the various digits. This belief is further bolstered at column 3, starting a line 39, “if the fingerprint and/or its orientation are precisely registered, it is also possible to identify not only a horizontal or vertical finger orientation, but also diagonal orientations lying at an angle between horizontal and vertical”. Therefore, Jerbi specifically relies upon precisely registered fingerprints to determine finger orientations, not the shape of the finger itself. The Applicant has taken the liberty of researching various fingerprint identification techniques “A fingerprint is an impression of the friction ridges on all parts of the finger.” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fingerprint_identification).

A number of claims have been amended to more specifically recite that it is the shape of the signet itself that is used in contrast to Jerbi that relies upon a precise registration of a fingerprint (i.e., a pattern).

Based in part upon the above remarks, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection thereof. Independent claims 8, 14, and 18 have been amended to recite essentially the same limitations as claim 1 and are also believed to be allowable. Applicants believe that dependent claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15-17 are also patentably distinct from

the cited reference for at least the same reasons as those recited above for the independent claims, upon which they ultimately depend.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687
408-255-8001